UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO

United States of America,) Case No. CR 12-7/211 M
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
John Paul Mc Millan	NOV 1 4 2012 NORTHERN US ON WIEKING NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALOURT
Defendant.) DISTRICT OF TOOL
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from <u>li/lu/lz</u> , 2012 to <u>li</u> by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and ba	$\frac{(1/(4/12))}{2/(6/12)}$, 2012, the Court excludes time under the $\frac{(1/(4/12))}{2/(6/12)}$, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proof or law, that it is unreasonable to expe	, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
——————————————————————————————————————	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, the diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 1	LAUREL BEILLER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney